

Appl. No. 10/743,588
Amdt. dated May 16, 2005
Reply to Office Action of March 22, 2005

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1 - 7 are in the application for consideration. Reconsideration of the application is requested in view of the amendments made in the claims and the statements appearing below herein.

1. The rejection of claim 8 under the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112 as failing to comply with the enablement requirement is no longer an issue since the claim has been canceled.

2. Claims 1-3, 5 and 7 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 4,932,577 ("Weiss") in view of U.S. 6,250,220 B1 ("Sainio et al.").

In addition, claim 6 has been objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim.

Claim 1 has been amended and now recites, in pertinent part

wherein each of said plurality of pressure rollers is arranged to overlap in length at least one next adjacent pressure roller along the length of said drive roller

The amendatory matter is fully supported by the application as originally filed and does not include any objectionable new matter. See, for example, Fig. 4 and the description at page 5, paragraph [016].

Appl. No. 10/743,588
Amdt. dated May 16, 2005
Reply to Office Action of March 22, 2005

Claim 1, as amended, recites a drive roller assembly, which is patentably distinguishable over the references of record. Claim 1 now provides that each of the pressure rollers has a length which is less than the length of the drive roller, that the pressure applied to the drive roller by each pressure roller can be adjusted independently of the others and that at least one of said plurality of pressure rollers is arranged to overlap in length at least one next adjacent pressure roller along the length of said drive roller.

As the examiner has acknowledged by indicating that claim 6 contains allowable subject matter, Weiss and Sainio et al., the references cited to support the rejection, do not teach or in any way suggest the drive assembly recited in amended claim 1.

Reconsideration of this ground of rejection and withdrawal thereof are respectfully requested.

3. Claim 4 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Weiss in view of Sainio et al. and U.S. 4,720,714 ("Yukio"). Yukio has been cited for the teaching of a drive roller assembly having a rigid drive roller with a plurality of helical grooves in a hard outer surface.

Appl. No. 10/743,588
Amdt. dated May 16, 2005
Reply to Office Action of March 22, 2005

Applicant traverses this ground of rejection. Claim 4 is dependent on claim 1 and is patentably distinguishable over the references for the same reasons advanced above with respect to Weiss and Sainio et al., and further, because Yukio does not teach or suggest the drive roller assembly recited in amended claim 1.

Reconsideration of this ground of rejection and withdrawal thereof are respectfully requested.

In summary, claims 1 - 7 are in the application and have been shown to be proper in form for allowance and in substance to be directed to a wholly novel and patentable drive roller assembly. Entrance of this amendment in the application is respectfully requested since it places the claims in condition for allowance.

Reconsideration of the application and allowance of the claims are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Gaetano D. Maccarone
Registration No. 25,173

Polaroid Corporation
Patent Department
1265 Main Street
Waltham, MA 02451
Tel.: 781-386-6405
Fax: 781-386-6435